

**Positive Train Control (PTC) Full Working Group**  
**June 29, 2000 - New Orleans, LA**

**June 29: Full Working Group Meeting convened at 930 a.m.**

- Dean Hollingsworth called to order the Full Working Group at 9:30 a.m. and distributed a group roster for all in attendance to sign. A safety briefing had been held at 8 a.m. as part of the Standards Task Force meeting, which the Full Working Group attended as observers.
- Ted Bundy asked the Data & Implementation working group to review the minutes of their May 2000 meeting. There were no comments and the task force voted to accept the minutes as they stand.
- Dr. Thomas Raslear, FRA Railroad Development, briefed the group on the Human Factors Team report of their last meeting in Sawgrass, Florida, December 1999. The two reports from this group, 1) Human Factors Team White Paper (Dated 11/28/99) and 2) Human Factors Team Training Report (Dated 12/03/99) were attached to the May 4, 2000 minutes of the Data & Implementation Working Group.
- David Matsuda, FRA Office of Chief Counsel, and Manual Galdo presented a brief overview of the draft of the PTC Standards Task Force Working Group Progress Report. Included in this briefing was the process for the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM).
- Rick Inclima raised language concerns on § 236.929, training specific to roadway workers. On track equipment is not addressed in this section. Mr. Inclima wanted the following language changes (see bolded/italicized verbiage):

**§ 236.927 Training specific to locomotive engineers and other *operating (delete)* personnel.**

**(a) *What elements apply to operating (delete) personnel?***

Training provided under this subpart for any locomotive engineer or other person who participates in the operation of a train ***or on-track equipment*** in train control territory must be defined in the PSP and the following elements must be addressed:

(1) Familiarization with train control equipment onboard the locomotive ***or on-track equipment*** and the functioning of that equipment as part of the system and in relation to other onboard systems under that person's control;

(2) Any actions required of the ***onboard (delete)*** personnel to enable, or enter data to, the system, such as consist data, and the role of that function in the safe operation of the train;

(4) Railroad operating rules applicable to the train control system, including provisions for movement and protection of any unequipped trains ***or on-track equipment***, or trains ***or on-track equipment*** with failed or cut out train control onboard systems and other on-track equipment;

**(b) *How must locomotive engineer (or other personnel) training be conducted?***

Training required under this subpart for a locomotive engineer, together with required records, must be integrated into the program of training required by part 240 of this title. ***Training required under this subpart for other personnel, together with required records, must be integrated into the program of training required by Part 214 of this title.***

(c) *What requirements apply to automatic operation?*

The following special requirements apply in the event a train control system is used to effect full automatic operation of the train *or on-track equipment*:

(1) The PSP must identify all safety hazards to be mitigated by the locomotive engineer *or on-track equipment operator*.

(2) The PSP must address and describe the training required with provisions for the maintenance of skills proficiency. As a minimum, the training program must:

(i) as described in § 236.923(a)(2), develop failure scenarios which incorporate the safety hazards identified in the PSP, including the return of train *or on-track equipment* operations to a fully manual mode;

(ii) provide training, consistent with § 236.923(a), for safe train operations *or on-track equipment* under all failure scenarios and identified safety hazards that affect train operations;

(iii) provide training, consistent with § 236.923(a), for safe train operations *or on-track equipment* under manual control; and

(iv) consistent with § 236.923(a), ensure maintenance of manual train operating skills by one or more of the following methods:

(A) manual starting and stopping of the train *or on-track equipment* once during each work period;

(B) manual operation of a train *or on-track equipment* an 8-hour work period once every 30 work periods;

(C) simulated manual operation of a train *or on-track equipment* in a Type I simulator once every 15 work periods; and

(D) other means as determined following consultation between the railroad and designated representatives of the affected employees and approved by the FRA.

- Mr. Inclima also wanted the following language changes in **236.927**:  
**§ 236.927 Training specific to locomotive engineers and other operating (delete) personnel.**

(a) *What elements apply to operating personnel?*

Training provided under this subpart for any locomotive engineer or other person who participates in the operation of a train *or on-track equipment* in train control territory must be defined in the PSP and the following elements must be addressed:

(1) Familiarization with train control equipment onboard the locomotive *or on-track equipment* and the functioning of that equipment as part of the system and in relation to other onboard systems under that person's control;

(2) Any actions required of the *onboard (delete)* personnel to enable, or enter data to, the system, such as consist data, and the role of that function in the safe operation of the train;

- Chuck Dettmann didn't think that the changes were acceptable, because he thought that where Mr. Inclima wanted to go with his proposed changes were already adequately discussed and covered in other areas of the NPRM.

- Bob Harvey stated that he thought Mr. Inclima's requirements would be provided for in the general training area of the text. He understood where Mr. Inclima was coming from, but thought it would be covered there and also in the RSPP and the PSP that are considered by FRA.
- Grady Cothen said that there were probably several areas where the NPRM language didn't cover things such as what Mr. Inclima brought up, and thought that Mr. Inclima's concerns should be covered in the meeting minutes, but agreed with Mr. Dettmann that he didn't think the language of the NPRM should be changed at this time. He also said that the language in § 236.919 adequately covered the situation (essential to the same thing Bob Harvey said). Mr. Cothen thinks that we are doubly covered.
- Rick Inclima said he thought it was well and good to discuss that his concerns were covered, but this might not hold true several years down the road if the language was missing from the rule. Mr. Inclima does not think the language is broad enough to cover on-track equipment.
- Larry Light suggested that Mr. Inclima's concern be addressed in the Preamble.
- Mr. Cothen stated that there are several places in the document where on-track equipment is addressed and can not be left out. Mr. Cothen pointed out that Page 78, line 5, of the clean copy was pretty specific about the training requirements of Roadway Workers whose duties are affected by PTC systems.
- Fran Hooper stated that on Page 48, lines 11 and 12 of the Preamble portion of the document, roadway workers are addressed.
- Bob Harvey stated on Page 78, line 23, task analysis requirements also covers Mr. Inclima's concerns, because the task analysis that has to be performed would have to include this.

Labor requested a caucus.

- Bob Harvey stated labor's undivided belief, that the language for on-track equipment will reflect back on Page 78, line 14, § 236.923 Task analysis and basic requirements. He said if they could get confirmation on that point, then they would likely be satisfied, but Mr. Inclima might want to add a bit of language to clarify this.
- Grady Cothen thinks that the current language provides for it, but wanted to hear from counsel. David Matsuda stated that the training for roadway workers could be added in the Preamble.
- Joe Mattingly and Chuck Dettmann both stated that Mr. Inclima's concerns are addressed in the document.
- Mr. Inclima withdrew his concerns reference to § 236.927, but indulge him on § 236.929, Page 81, end of line 11, to include the statement **“training required under this subpart for roadway worker protection must be consistent with the requirements of Part 214, and the task analysis requirements of § 236.923”**.
- Mr. Cothen stated that he had no substantive objections, but when you say something in one place, and it isn't followed up in other places, then people might reasonably ask “Why is it referenced here, but not in these other places?” He said that at a minimum, FRA would want to make sure that counsel would have the opportunity to make any Preamble changes necessary to ensure consistency.
- The group voted on Mr. Inclima's request that on page 81, line 11, include the above added language.

- Grady Cothen addressed some concerns raised by suppliers. FRA would make certain that the references to the term “risk” were clarified to cover when the common meaning of the word was intended, vs. the validation & verification process meaning of the word “mean time between hazardous failures (MTBHF)”.
- Grady Cothen asked that the North American PTC Project go forward with the understanding that FRA need not be overwhelmed with documents, and that perhaps Bob Gallamore could prepare some sort of a template for non-regulatory guidance. He also said that the full PTC Working Group be kept informed of the progress. He suggested that a web page where the group could view the substantive documents might be helpful.
- Chuck Dettmann indicated that in the Preamble, there are references to CRAM II. No meetings or discussions of where that model is, as to it relates to this project. The Preamble should reflect that either CRAM II is or is not a part of this rulemaking. It should accurately reflect what has or what has not been done.
- Grady Cothen stated that FRA and Volpe had been actively working to resolve some CRAM II issues, and that there would be some sort of peer review once this was completed.
- Dean Hollingsworth asked the group to vote on sending the document, PTC Standards Task Force NPRM Draft #7 - June 7, 2000 - Clean Copy, to the full RSAC once FRA had made the changes resulting from the Standards Task Force and Full Working Group meeting inputs.
- The group voted unanimously to accept the document and forward to the full RSAC.
- Dr. Ted Giras briefed the group on ASCAP.
- Grady Cothen stated that the availability of National differential Global Positioning Systems (NdGPS) funding was turned off on May 1. He also stated that 18.7 million dollars was favorably handled by the Senate. Expect to go forward with the project.
- Bob Gallamore briefed the group on the progress of the North American Joint Positive Train Control Program.
- Bob McCown stated that the House gave us the requested 10 M, but the Senate cut 7 M. There is a broad agency announcement, up to 4 M in funding and additional funding in FY01 budget. In both cases, there will be 3 M available for the ATK Michigan project. He thought the differences would be worked out in conference. He also said that FRA issued a “Broad Agency Announcement” in the Commerce Business Daily on next generation high-speed rail funding, which will also cover train control projects but not to the extent there would be money for new concepts.
- Grady Cothen opened a brief discussion by adding his thanks for the efforts of the entire PTC Working Group, and in particular to the Standards Working Group. Mr. Cothen stated that the Standards Task Force should remain intact for one future meeting on the conclusion of the final rule. The Data & Implementation Group has concluded their work and that they dissolve at this point and some members regroup to the full working group. He also emphasized the need to get the full working group listing current<sup>1</sup>. Mr. Cothen suggested that the PTC Working Group meet on a quarterly basis. It was agreed that the Data & Implementation Task Force remain “on the shelf” but not officially dissolved at this point.
- The next meeting of the PTC Full Working Group will be held on November 9, 2000, somewhere in the Eastern

Time Zone.

- Bob Dorer wanted clarification as to whether VOLPE will continue to maintain the website for distribution of minutes and additional updated information on CRAM. This will be resolved with FRA in the near future.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

<sup>1</sup> Membership should be re-established with Patricia Paoletta at FRA HQ.